



\$~19

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 17559/2022 CM APPL. 56074/2022**

NAVDEEP CHAUDHARY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. U S Maurya, Adv. with Mr. S.S
Maurya and Mr. Diwakar Singh
Maurya, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nirvikar Verma, SPC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER
21.01.2026

%

1. This petition has been filed with the following prayers:

(a) A suitable writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the order dated 12-12-2022 passed by Respondent No. 3, terminating the services of the petitioner due to Low Medical category by stating he is unfit for further training/service whereas, petitioner injured "AVN Right Femoral Head Secondary to Fracture Neck of Right Femur" during Physical Proficiency Test (PPT), as the same is stated in Order of Court of Inquiry dated 24-05-2018.

(b) Direct the Respondent No. 3 to rehabilitation the petitioner as per para 7 of Standing Order No. 01/2013 dated 28.03.2013 issued by Respondent No. 2 on subject: "Disposal of Permanent Low Medical Category cases and Rehabilitation of Permanent Low Medical Category of Indo Tibetan Border Police" and petitioner's case is squarely covered by the case of CWP No. 9608 of 2019 **Chander Pal Vs. Union of India and**



Ors. order dated 10-04-2019 of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana and **Nemi Chand Jatav Vs. Union of India & Ors.** [WP (C) 4901/2019 order dated 14-05-2019 & 02-12-2019 of this Hon'ble Court and above both are still in service till date.

(c) Pass any other suitable writ, order of direction as the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the present case.

(d) Award cost of the petition to the petitioner/s.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent states that the order dated 12.12.2022, which has been passed by the respondent terminating the services of the petitioner has been cancelled vide order dated 03.02.2023 and as such the petition has become infructuous.

3. Mr. U.S. Maurya learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the submission made by the learned counsel for the respondents.

4. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

JANUARY 21, 2026

hp